arXiv:1606.03687v1 [cs.DM] 12 Jun 2016

A Simple Extension of Dirac's Theorem on Hamiltonicity[☆]

Yasemin Büyükçolak[a,*], Didem Gözüpek[b], Sibel Özkan[a], Mordechai Shalom[c,d,1]

[a] *Department of Mathematics, Gebze Technical University, Kocaeli, Turkey*
[b] *Department of Computer Engineering, Gebze Technical University, Kocaeli, Turkey*
[c] *TelHai College, Upper Galilee, 12210, Israel*
[d] *Department of Industrial Engineering, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey*

Abstract

The classical Dirac theorem asserts that every graph G on n vertices with minimum degree $\delta(G) \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$ is Hamiltonian. The lower bound of $\lceil n/2 \rceil$ on the minimum degree of a graph is tight. In this paper, we extend the classical Dirac theorem to the case where $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ by identifying the only non-Hamiltonian graph families in this case. We first present a short and simple proof. We then provide an alternative proof that is constructive and self-contained. Consequently, we provide a polynomial-time algorithm that constructs a Hamiltonian cycle, if exists, of a graph G with $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, or determines that the graph is non-Hamiltonian. Finally, we present a self-contained proof for our algorithm which provides insight into the structure of Hamiltonian cycles when $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and is promising for extending the results of this paper to the cases with smaller degree bounds.

Keywords: Hamiltonian cycle, sufficiency condition, minimum degree, Dirac theorem, extension, self-contained, constructive, graph algorithms.

1. Introduction

A cycle passing through every vertex of a graph G exactly once is called a *Hamiltonian cycle* of G, and a graph containing a Hamiltonian cycle is called *Hamiltonian*. Finding a Hamiltonian cycle in a graph is a fundamental problem in graph theory and has been widely studied. In 1972, Karp [1] proved that the problem of determining whether a given graph is Hamiltonian is NP-complete. Hence, finding sufficient conditions for Hamiltonicity has been an interesting problem in graph theory.

[☆] This work is supported by TUBITAK-CNRS under grant no. 114E731.
[*] Corresponding author.
Email addresses: y.buyukcolak@gtu.edu.tr (Yasemin Büyükçolak), didem.gozupek@gtu.edu.tr (Didem Gözüpek), s.ozkan@gtu.edu.tr (Sibel Özkan), cmshalom@telhai.ac.il (Mordechai Shalom)
[1] The work of this author is supported in part by the TUBITAK 2221 Programme.

An important sufficient condition for Hamiltonicity proved in 1952 by Dirac [2] is that every graph on n vertices with minimum degree at least $\lceil n/2 \rceil$ is Hamiltonian. This lower bound on the minimum degree is tight, i.e., for every $k < \lceil n/2 \rceil$, there is a non-Hamiltonian graph with minimum degree k. In 1960, Ore [3] proved that if for all distinct nonadjacent pairs of vertices u and v of a graph G, the sum of degrees of u and v is at least the order of G, then G is Hamiltonian. In 1976, Bondy and Chvátal [4] proved that a graph G is Hamiltonian if and only if its closure is Hamiltonian.

Some additional sufficient conditions have been found for special graph classes. In 1966, Nash-Williams [5] proved that every k-regular graph on $2k + 1$ vertices is Hamiltonian. In 1971, Nash-Williams [6] also proved that a 2-connected graph of order n with independence number β and minimum degree at least $\max\{(n+2)/3, \beta\}$ is Hamiltonian. Note that this result is stronger than the classical Dirac theorem. However, since finding the independence number of a graph is in general NP-hard, this result does not yield an efficient algorithm; i.e., the sufficiency condition cannot be tested in polynomial-time unless P = NP.

The Rahman-Kaykobad condition given in [7] is a relatively new condition that helps to determine the Hamiltonicity of a given graph G: The condition is that for every two nonadjacent pair of vertices u, v of G, we have $d(u) + d(v) + dist(u, v) > |V|$, where $d(v)$ denotes the degree of v and $dist(u, v)$ denotes the length of a shortest path between u and v. In 2005, Rahman and Kaykobad [7] proved that a connected graph satisfying the Rahman-Kaykobad condition has a Hamiltonian path. In 2007, Mehedy et al. [8] proved that for a graph G without cut edges and cut vertices and satisfying the Rahman-Kaykobad condition, the existence of a Hamiltonian path with endpoints u and v and $dist(u, v) \geq 3$ implies that G is Hamiltonian. In [9] and [10], it is proven that if G is a 2-connected graph of order $n \geq 3$ and $d(u) + d(v) \geq n - 1$ for every pair of vertices u and v with $dist(u, v) = 2$, then G is Hamiltonian or a member of a given non-Hamiltonian graph class.

Another important property of graphs related with Hamiltonicity is toughness. It is easy to see that being 1-tough is a necessary condition for Hamiltonicity. In 1978, Jung [11] proved that a 1-tough graph G on $n > 11$ vertices with the sum of degrees of non-adjacent vertices u and v at least $n - 4$ is Hamiltonian. In 1990, Bauer, Morgana and Schmeichel [12] provided a simple proof of Jung's theorem for graphs with more than 15 vertices. However, in 1990 Bauer, Hakimi and Schmeichel [13] proved that recognizing 1-tough graphs is NP-hard. On the other hand, in 2002 Bauer et al. [14] presented a constructive proof of Jung's theorem for graphs on more than 15 vertices. Furthermore,

in 1992 Häggkvist [15] independently showed that for graphs on n vertices with $\delta(G) \geq n/2 - k$, the existence of a Hamiltonian cycle can be recognized in time $O(n^{5k})$ where $k \geq 0$ is any fixed integer.

In this paper, we first prove that a graph G with $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ is Hamiltonian except two specific families of graphs. We first provide a simple proof using Nash-Williams theorem [6]. We then provide an alternative proof, which is simple, constructive, and self-contained. Using the constructive nature of our proof, we propose a polynomial-time algorithm that, given a graph G with $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, constructs a Hamiltonian cycle of G, or says that G is non-Hamiltonian. The main distinction of our work from [8] is that we propose a sufficient condition for Hamiltonicity by using condition $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and provide explicit non-Hamiltonian graph families, whereas [8] uses the Rahman-Kaykobad condition. Our proof also provides a novel insight into the pattern of vertices in a Hamiltonian cycle. We believe that this insight will play a pivotal role in extending our current results to a more general case. Notice that [9] and [10] shows the same non-Hamiltonian graph classes as in our work. However, unlike [9] and [10], we obtain these graph classes constructively as a result of the nature of our proof. On the other hand, our main distinction from [15] is that, [15] shows the polynomial-time recognizability of only the existence of a Hamiltonian cycle under such a minimum degree condition, whereas we construct a Hamiltonian cycle (if exists) in addition to determining whether a Hamiltonian cycle exists when $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. In other words, [15] leads only to a decision algorithm, whereas we provide a construction algorithm.

Jung's theorem states that if G is a 1-tough graph on $n \geq 11$ vertices such that $d(x) + d(y) \geq n - 4$ for all distinct nonadjacent vertices $x, y \in V(G)$, then G is Hamiltonian. Bauer provided a constructive proof of Jung's theorem in [12]. If $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, a constructive algorithm can then be designed as follows: Run the decision algorithm of Häggkvist [15] to determine whether there is a Hamiltonian cycle. If yes, then construct a Hamiltonian cycle using the constructive proof of Bauer in [12]. However, this approach has three main drawbacks: Unlike this work, (i) such an approach fails to specify non-Hamiltonian graph families under the minimum degree condition $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, (ii) it is not self-contained, (iii) it does not explicitly provide a polynomial-time algorithm. Furthermore, this paper provides a shorter and simpler proof than [12]. Finally, our algorithm can be used to generate all Hamiltonian cycles under the condition $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$.

2. Preliminaries

We adopt [16] for terminology and notation not defined here. A graph $G = (V, E)$ is given by a pair of a vertex set $V = V(G)$ and an edge set $E = E(G)$ where $uv \in E(G)$ denotes an edge between two vertices u and v. In this work, we consider only simple graphs, i.e., graphs without loops or multiple edges. In particular, we use G_n to denote a not necessarily connected simple graph on n vertices. $|V(G)|$ denotes the order of G and $N(v)$ denotes the neighborhood of a vertex v of G. In addition, $\delta(G)$ denotes the minimum degree of G and the *distance* $dist(u, v)$ between two vertices u and v is the length of a shortest path joining u and v, whereas the *diameter* of G, denoted by $diam(G)$, is the maximum distance among all pairs of vertices of G. If $P = x_0x_1x_2 \dots x_k$ is a path, then we say that x_i *precedes* (resp. *follows*) x_{i+1} (resp. x_{i-1}).

Given two graphs $G = (V, E)$ and $G' = (V', E')$, we define the following binary operations. The *union* $G \cup G'$ of G and G' is the graph obtained by the union of their vertex and edge sets, i.e., $G \cup G' = (V \cup V', E \cup E')$. When V and V' are disjoint, their union is referred to as the *disjoint union* and denoted by $G + G'$. The *join* $G \vee G'$ of G and G' is the disjoint union of graphs G and G' together with all the edges joining V and V'. Formally, $G \vee G' = (V \cup V', E \cup E' \cup \{V \times V'\})$. K_n and $\overline{K_n}$ denote the complete and empty graph, respectively, on n vertices.

The classical Dirac theorem is as follows:

Theorem 1. ***(Dirac [2])*** *If G is a graph of order $n \geq 3$ such that $\delta(G) \geq n/2$, then G is Hamiltonian.*

We now present the main theorem of this paper:

Theorem 2. *Let G be a connected graph of order $n \geq 3$ such that $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Then G is Hamiltonian unless G is the graph $K_{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \cup K_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ with one common vertex or a graph $\overline{K}_{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \vee G_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ for odd n.*

The constructive nature of our proof for Theorem 2 given in Section 3 yields the following result:

Theorem 3. *Let G be a graph of order $n \geq 3$ such that $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Then there is a polynomial-time algorithm that determines whether a Hamiltonian cycle exists and finds a Hamiltonian cycle in G, if such a cycle exists.*

We provide the proof of Theorem 3 in Section 4.

3. Proofs of Theorem 2

In this section, we prove Theorem 2 of this paper, which extends the classical Dirac theorem. Using Nash-William's theorem [6], we first provide a simple proof.

Lemma 4. *[6] Let G be a 2-connected graph of order n with independence number $\beta(G)$ and minimum degree $\delta(G)$. If $\delta(G) \geq \max((n+2)/3, \beta(G))$, then G is Hamiltonian.*

Proof-1 of Theorem 2. Let G be a non-Hamiltonian graph on n vertices with $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Since for even n, non-Hamiltonicity would contradict Dirac's theorem, n must be odd. Let $n = 2r+1$ where $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

First, consider the case that G is not 2-connected, and consider a cut vertex v. Let $G[V(G) \setminus \{v\}]$ have k connected components G_i where $1 \leq i \leq k$. Since $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor = r$, we have $|V(G_i)| - 1 \geq \delta(G_i) \geq r-1$, thus $|V(G_i)| \geq r$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Since $n = 2r+1$, we have $k = 2$ and $|V(G_1)| = |V(G_2)| = r$. Therefore, the only 1-connected graph G with $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ is the graph $K_{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \cup K_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ with one common vertex.

Now consider the case that G is 2-connected. If $n \geq 7$, $\delta(G) \geq (n-1)/2 \geq (n+2)/3$. If $\delta(G) \geq \beta(G)$, then $\delta(G) \geq \max((n+2)/3, \beta(G))$ and G is Hamiltonian due to Lemma 4, contradiction. Therefore, $\beta(G) > \delta(G) \geq (n-1)/2$ and hence $\beta(G) \geq (n+1)/2$. In other words, there is an independent set S with size $(n+1)/2$. Since $\delta(G) \geq (n-1)/2$, each vertex in the independent set S has to be adjacent to each vertex in $V(G) \setminus S$, which results in the graph $\overline{K}_{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \vee G_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$.

For $n = 3$, the only 2-connected graph is a cycle on 3 vertices, which is Hamiltonian. For $n = 5$ consider the minimal graphs G with $\delta(G) \geq 2$, where by minimality we imply that removal of an edge violates the degree condition $\delta(G) \geq 2$. The vertices U of degree more than 2 in G constitute an independent set because otherwise it would not be minimal. Let $\overline{U} = V(G) \setminus U$. Since $n = 5$ and $\delta(G) \geq 2$, We have $\left|\overline{U}\right| \geq 3$, i.e. $|U| \leq 2$. If $U = \emptyset$, then G is a cycle, a contradiction. If $U = \{u\}$ and $d(u) = 4$, the degree sequence of $G[\overline{U}]$ is $(1,1,1,1)$ and u is a cut vertex, contradicting 2-connectivity. If $U = \{u\}$ and $d(u) = 3$ the degree sequence of $G[\overline{U}]$ is $(2,1,1,1)$, a contradiction since such a graph with odd degree sum does not exist. If $|U| = 2$, G contains a $K_{2,3}$ with possible additional edges between vertices of $\overline{U}$. If there are no such additional edges, G is a $K_{2,3}$ and satisfies the claim. Otherwise, if there is such an additional edge, one can build a Hamiltonian path of $K_{2,3}$ and close it to a cycle using this edge, contradiction. □

We now present not only simple, but also self-contained and constructive proof. Our proof is inspired by the proof of the following theorem in [5].

Lemma 5. *[5] Every k-regular graph on $2k+1$ vertices is Hamiltonian.*

We now give the proof for Theorem 2 as follows:

Proof-2 of Theorem 2. For $n = 2r$ where $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the result holds by Theorem 1. Hence, we assume that $n = 2r+1$ and $\delta(G) \geq r$. First, we consider the graph G' obtained by adding a new vertex y to G and connecting it to all other vertices. The graph G' has $|V(G')| = 2r+2$ vertices and minimum degree $\delta(G') \geq r+1$. By Theorem 1, G' has a Hamiltonian cycle C. The path P obtained by the removal of y from C is a Hamiltonian path of G. Let $P = x_0x_1 \dots x_{2r}$.

Suppose G has no Hamiltonian cycle. That is, x_0 and x_{2r} are not adjacent. Then, we observe the following facts:

1. *If x_0 is adjacent to x_i, then x_{2r} is not adjacent to x_{i-1}.* Otherwise, the closed trail $x_0x_1 \dots x_{i-1}x_{2r}x_{2r-1}x_{2r-2} \dots x_ix_0$ is a Hamiltonian cycle.
2. *If x_0 is not adjacent to x_i, then x_{2r} is adjacent to x_{i-1}.* By the first fact, $N(x_{2r}) \subseteq X = \{x_{i-1} | x_i \notin N(x_0), i \geq 1\}$. Since $|X| = r$ and $d(x_{2r}) = r$, then $N(x_{2r}) = X$.
3. *Every pair of non-adjacent vertices x_i and x_j, where $0 \leq i, j \leq 2r$, has at least one common neighbor.* This is because $N(x_i) \subseteq V(G) \backslash \{x_i, x_j\}$, $N(x_j) \subseteq V(G) \backslash \{x_i, x_j\}$, $d(x_i) \geq r$, and $d(x_j) \geq r$. Note that this implies $diam(G) = 2$.

Assume that $d(x_0) > r$. By Fact 1, the vertex x_{2r} cannot be adjacent to at least $r+2$ vertices of G including itself. Since $n = 2r+1$, it implies that $d(x_{2r}) \leq r-1$, contradicting with $\delta(G) \geq r$. Similarly, if $d(x_{2r}) > r$, then $d(x_0) \leq r-1$ by the symmetry of the Hamiltonian path P, again contradiction. Therefore, $d(x_0) = d(x_{2r}) = r$.

We now consider two disjoint and complementary cases:

1. $\underline{N(x_0) \cup N(x_{2r}) = V(G) \setminus \{x_0, x_{2r}\}}$: By this assumption and Fact 3, x_0 and x_{2r} have exactly one common neighbor x_k. Then x_{k-1} is not adjacent to x_{2r} but adjacent to x_0. Proceeding in the same way, we conclude that $N(x_0) = \{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ and $N(x_{2r}) = \{x_k, \dots, x_{2r-1}\}$. Since $d(x_0) = d(x_{2r}) = r$, we conclude that $k = r$. Let $i \in [r+1, 2r-1]$ and $i_0 \in [0, r-1]$. If $x_{i_0}x_i \in E$, the cycle $x_{i_0}x_{i_0-1} \dots x_0x_{i_0+1}x_{i_0+2} \dots x_{i-1}x_{2r}x_{2r-1} \dots x_ix_{i_0}$ is a Hamiltonian cycle of G. Therefore, for every $i \in [r+1, 2r-1]$ and every $i_0 \in [0, r-1]$, x_i and x_{i_0} are non-adjacent. Then $G = K_{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \cup K_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ with one common vertex x_r. Note that G is not Hamiltonian since it contains a cut vertex, namely x_r.
2. $\underline{N(x_0) \cup N(x_{2r}) \neq V(G) \setminus \{x_0, x_{2r}\}}$: Then there is an $i_0 \in [2, 2r-2]$ such that x_{i_0+1} is adjacent to x_0, but x_{i_0} is not. By Fact 2, x_{i_0-1} is adjacent to x_{2r}. Hence,

we have a $(2r)$-cycle $x_{i_0-1}x_{i_0-2}\dots x_0x_{i_0+1}x_{i_0+2}\dots x_{2r}x_{i_0-1}$ which does not contain x_{i_0}, say C. We rename the vertices of C such that $y_1y_2\dots y_{2r}$ and $y_0 = x_{i_0}$. If y_0 is adjacent to two consecutive vertices of C, then G is Hamiltonian. Therefore, y_0 is not adjacent to two consecutive vertices of C. Combining this with the fact that $d_{y_0} \geq r$ we conclude that $d(y_0) = r$ and y_0 is adjacent to every second vertex of C. Without loss of generality, let $N(y_0) = \{y_1, y_3, ..., y_{2r-1}\}$. Observe that by replacing y_{2i} by y_0 for some $i \in [1, r]$ we obtain another cycle with $2r$ vertices. Then, by the same argument $N(y_{2i}) = \{y_1, y_3, ..., y_{2r-1}\}$ for every $i \in [0, 2]$. Hence, $G = \overline{K}_{\lceil n/2 \rceil} \vee G_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ where the vertices with even index form the empty graph $\overline{K}_{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$ and the vertices with odd index form a not necessarily connected graph $G_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$. Notice that G is not Hamiltonian since it contains an independent set with more than half of the vertices, namely $\{y_0, \dots, y_{2r}\}$.

□

Note that we have obtained the non-Hamiltonian graph classes constructively.

In the following section, by using the proof of Theorem 2, we propose a polynomial-time algorithm for finding a Hamiltonian cycle of a given graph G with order n and $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, if it exists, or returns "none" if it does not exist.

4. Proof of Theorem 3

In this section we present Algorithm FindHamiltonian that, given a graph G, returns either a Hamiltonian cycle C or "NONE". Although FindHamiltonian may in general return "NONE" for a Hamiltonian graph G, we will show that this will not happen if $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. FindHamiltonian, whose pseudo code is given in Algorithm 1, first tests G for the two exceptional graph families mentioned in Theorem 2. Once G passes the tests, the algorithm first builds a maximal path by starting with an edge and then extending it in both directions as long as this is possible. After this stage, the algorithm tries to find a larger path by closing the path to a cycle and then adding to it a new vertex and opening it back to a path. Once the path is closed to a cycle, it is clearly possible to extend it to a larger path, since G is connected. It remains to show that under the conditions of Theorem 2, i.e. $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, the algorithm will always be able to construct a cycle from the vertices of P. This is done in function MakeCycle, which in turn tries three different constructions using the functions MakeTypeACycle (see Figure 1), MakeTypeBCycle (see Figure 2), and MakeTypeCCycle (see Figure 3).

Note that Algorithm 1 is polynomial since i) Lines 1-5 can be computed in polynomial time, ii) constructing a maximal path in Lines 7-8, constructing a cycle in Line 9, and obtaining a larger maximal path in Lines 10-13 can be done in polynomial time, iii) the loop in Lines 6-14 iterates at most n times. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *Let $|V(G)| = n$, $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and P be a maximal path of G. If function* MakeCycle *returns NONE, then either G has a cut vertex or an independent set I with more than $n/2$ vertices constituting a connected component of $\bar{G}$.*



Figure 1: The cycles detected by MakeTypeACycle



Figure 2: The cycles detected by MakeTypeBCycle



Figure 3: The cycles detected by MakeTypeCCycle

Proof. Let $P = x_0x_1 \dots x_k$ be a maximal path of G for some $k \leq n-1$. Assume that the functions MakeTypeACycle, MakeTypeBCycle and MakeTypeCCycle all return "NONE". Since P is maximal, $N(x_0), N(x_k) \subseteq V(P)$. Suppose that $x_0x_k \in E(G)$. Then, setting $i = 0$ and $j = k-1$ in function MakeTypeACycle would detect a cycle. Therefore, $x_0x_k \notin E(G)$, i.e. $N(x_0), N(x_k) \subseteq V(A) = \{x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}\}$ where A is the path obtained by deleting the endpoints x_0 and x_k of P. We partition $V(A)$ by the adjacency of their vertices to x_0 and x_k. We denote the set of vertices $N(x_0) \setminus N(x_k)$ by A_0, $N(x_k) \setminus N(x_0)$ by A_k, $N(x_0) \cap N(x_k)$ by A_{0k}, and the set of vertices $A \setminus (N(x_0) \cup N(x_k))$ by $A_{\overline{0k}}$. In the sequel we use a_p to denote an arbitrary element of A_p for $p \in \{0, k, 0k, \overline{0k}\}$, and we use regular expression notation for sequences of elements of these sets. In particular, $*$ denotes zero or more repetitions of a pattern.

Suppose that $x_i \in N(x_k)$ and $x_{i+1} \in N(x_0)$ for some $x_i \in V(A)$. Then, for this value of i and for $j = k-1$, the function MakeTypeACycle would detect a cycle. We conclude that such a vertex x_i does not exist in A. In other words, two consecutive vertices (x_i, x_{i+1}) of A do not follow any of the following forbidden patterns: (a_k, a_0), (a_k, a_{0k}), (a_{0k}, a_0), (a_{0k}, a_{0k}).

Consider two vertices $x_i, x_j \in A_{0k}$ $(i < j)$, with no vertices from A_{0k} between them in A. Furthermore, suppose that there are no vertices from $A_{\overline{0k}}$ between x_i and x_j. By these assumptions and due to the forbidden pairs previously mentioned, we have $x_{i+1} \dots, x_{j-1} \in A_k$. However, (x_{j-1}, x_j) is also a forbidden pair, contradiction. Therefore, there is at least one vertex from $A_{\overline{0k}}$ between any two vertices of A_{0k}. We conclude that $\left|A_{\overline{0k}}\right| \geq |A_{0k}| - 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} n-2 &\geq k-1 = |A_{0k}| + |A_k| + |A_0| + \left|A_{\overline{0k}}\right| = (|A_{0k}| + |A_k|) + (|A_{0k}| + |A_0|) + \left|A_{\overline{0k}}\right| - |A_{0k}| \\ &\geq d(x_k) + d(x_0) - 1 \geq 2\delta(G) - 1 \\ \frac{n-1}{2} &\geq \delta(G). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \geq \frac{n-1}{2}$, we have $\delta(G) = \frac{n-1}{2}$, and all the inequalities above hold with equality, implying the following:

a) $d(x_0) = d(x_k) = \delta(G) = \frac{n-1}{2}$, thus n is odd and $|A_k| = |A_0|$.

b) $k = n-1$, thus $V(P) = V(G)$.

c) $\left|A_{\overline{0k}}\right| = |A_{0k}| - 1$. There is exactly one vertex of $A_{\overline{0k}}$ between two consecutive vertices from A_{0k} and there are no other vertices from $A_{\overline{0k}}$ in A.

The vertices between (and including) two consecutive vertices from A_{0k} follow the pattern $(a_{0k}a_k^*a_{\overline{0k}}a_0^*a_{0k})$. All the vertices before the first vertex from A_{0k} are from A_0, and all

the vertices after the last vertex from A_{0k} are from A_k. We conclude that A follows the pattern:

$$a_0^*(a_{0k}a_k^*a_{\overline{0k}}a_0^*)^*a_{0k}a_k^*$$

Then, every vertex of $A_{\overline{0k}}$ is preceded by a neighbor of x_k and followed by a neighbor of x_0; in other words, a vertex $x_i \in A_{\overline{0k}}$ satisfies the condition in Line 4 of MakeTypeBCycle. Since, because our assumption, MakeTypeBCycle does not close a cycle, the condition in Line 6 is not satisfied for any value of j. We conclude that x_i is not adjacent to two consecutive vertices of A. Then, the number of neighbours of x_i among $x_1, \ldots, x_{i-1}$ is at most $\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \rceil$ and the number of neighbours of x_i among $x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_{k-1}$ is at most $\lceil \frac{k-1-i}{2} \rceil$. Therefore,

$$d(x_i) \leq \left\lceil \frac{i-1}{2} \right\rceil + \left\lceil \frac{k-1-i}{2} \right\rceil \leq \frac{i}{2} + \frac{k-i}{2} = \frac{k}{2} = \frac{n-1}{2} = \delta(G).$$

Since $d(x_i) \geq \delta(G)$, all the inequalities above hold with equality, implying the following:

1. Both i and k are even
2. $N(x_i) = A_{odd}$ where $A_{odd} = \{x_1, x_3, \ldots, x_{k-1}\}$.

Since for every $x_i \in A_{\overline{0k}}$, x_i is even and $N(x_i) = A_{odd}$, we conclude that $A_{\overline{0k}}$ is an independent set. Recalling that $x_0x_k \notin E(G)$ and the definition of $A_{\overline{0k}}$, we conclude that $I = A_{\overline{0k}} \cup \{x_0, x_k\}$ is an independent set.

We observe in the previous pattern that the set of vertices preceding the neighbours of x_0 (i.e. $A_0 \cup A_{0k}$) is $A_0 \cup A_{\overline{0k}}$, and the set of vertices following the neighbours of x_k (i.e. $A_k \cup A_{0k}$) is $A_k \cup A_{\overline{0k}}$. Let x_i be a vertex that precedes a neighbour of x_0 and let x_j be a vertex that follows a neighbour of x_k with $i < j$. If $x_ix_j \in E$, MakeTypeACycle can close a cycle since the condition in Line 5 is satisfied. Therefore, a pair of adjacent vertices (x_i, x_j) with $i < j$ in G cannot follow one of the following patterns: $(a_{\overline{0k}}, a_{\overline{0k}})$,$(a_{\overline{0k}}, a_k)$,$(a_0, a_{\overline{0k}})$,$(a_0, a_k)$. If $\left|A_{\overline{0k}}\right| = 0$, then $|A_{0k}| = 1$ and A follows the pattern $a_0^*a_{0k}a_k^*$. Since (a_0, a_k) is a forbidden pattern for adjacent vertices, none of the vertices of A_0 is adjacent to a vertex in A_k. Therefore, the unique vertex $a_{0k} \in A_{0k}$ is a cut vertex of G, contradicting our assumption. We conclude that $\left|A_{\overline{0k}}\right| > 0$.

Let $x_i \in A_{\overline{0k}}$ and $x_j \in A_{odd} = N(x_i)$. If $j < i$ then $x_j \notin A_0$, since otherwise they follow the pattern $(a_0, a_{\overline{0k}})$ and they are adjacent. Similarly, if $i < j$ then $x_j \notin A_k$. We conclude that, in A all the vertices between two vertices from $A_{\overline{0k}}$ are from A_{0k}. Moreover, all vertices before the first (after the last) vertex from $A_{\overline{0k}}$ except one vertex from A_{0k} are from A_k (resp. A_0). Then A follows the pattern:

$$a_{0k}a_k^*(a_{\overline{0k}}a_{0k})^*a_{\overline{0k}}a_0^*a_{0k}$$

We now observe that $x_{k-1} \in A_{0k}$, i.e. $x_0x_{k-1} \in E(G)$. Let $\eta = |A_k| = |A_0|$. Suppose that $\eta \neq 0$. Then $x_kx_1, x_kx_2 \in E(G)$ and MakeTypeCCycle will close a cycle. Therefore, $\eta = 0$, i.e. A follows the pattern:

$$(a_{0k}a_{\overline{0k}})^*a_{0k}$$

We conclude that I has $|I| = \frac{n+1}{2}$ vertices, and every vertex of I is adjacent to every vertex of $A_{odd} = A_{0k} = V(G) \setminus I$. Then I is a connected component of $\overline{G}$. □

Algorithm 1 FindHamiltonian

Require: A graph G with $|V(G)| = n$ and $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$

Ensure: C is a cycle of G

1: **if** G has a cut vertex **then return** NONE.
2: $\bar{G} \leftarrow$ the complement of G.
3: $\bar{H} \leftarrow$ the biggest connected component of $\overline{G}$.
4: **if** $\bar{H}$ is a complete graph and $\left|V(\bar{H})\right| \geq \frac{n}{2}$ **then return** NONE.
5: $P \leftarrow$ a trivial path in G.
6: **repeat**
7: **while** P is not maximal **do**
8: Append an edge to P. ▷ P is a maximal path in G.
9: $C \leftarrow$ MakeCycle(G, P)
10: **if** $C \neq$ NONE and $|V(C)| \neq |V(G)|$ **then**
11: Let e be an edge with exactly one endpoint in C.
12: Let e' be an edge of C incident to e ▷ There are two such edges.
13: $P \leftarrow C + e - e'$
14: **until** $|V(C)| = |V(H)|$ or $C =$ NONE
15: **return** C. ▷ C is a Hamiltonian cycle of G.

16: **function** MakeCycle(G, P)

Require: P is a maximal path in G.

Ensure: return a cycle C such that $V(C) = V(P)$ or "NONE"

17: $C \leftarrow$ MakeTypeACycle(G, P)
18: **if** $C \neq$ NONE **then return** C.
19: $C \leftarrow$ MakeTypeBCycle(G, P)
20: **if** $C \neq$ NONE **then return** C.
21: $C \leftarrow$ MakeTypeCCycle(G, P)
22: **if** $C \neq$ NONE **then return** C.
23: **return** NONE.

Algorithm 2 Making a Type-A Cycle

function MakeTypeACycle(G, P)

Require: P is a maximal path in G.

Ensure: return a cycle C such that $V(C) = V(P)$ or "NONE"

Let $P = x_0x_1 \dots x_k$.
for $i \in [0, k-3]$ **do**
  for $j \in [i+2, k-1]$ **do**
    if $x_0x_{i+1} \in E(G)$ and $x_ix_{j+1} \in E(G)$ and $x_jx_k \in E(G)$ **then**
      return $C = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_i, x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, \dots, x_k, x_j, x_{j-1} \dots, x_{i+1}, x_0)$.
return NONE.

Algorithm 3 Making a Type-B Cycle

function MakeTypeBCycle(G, P)

Require: P is a maximal path in G.

Ensure: return a cycle C such that $V(C) = V(P)$ or "NONE"

Let $P = x_0x_1 \dots x_k$.
for $i \in [k-2]$ **do**
  if $x_0x_{i+1} \in E(G)$ and $x_{i-1}x_k \in E(G)$ **then**
    for $j \in [k-1] \setminus \{i\}$ **do**
      if $x_ix_j \in E(G)$ and $x_ix_{j+1} \in E(G)$ **then**
        return $C = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{i-1}, x_k, x_{k-1}, \dots, x_{j+1}, x_i, x_j, x_{j-1} \dots, x_{i+1}, x_0)$.
return NONE.

Algorithm 4 Making a Type-C Cycle

function MakeTypeCCycle(G, P)

Require: P is a maximal path in G.

Ensure: return a cycle C such that $V(C) = V(P)$ or "NONE"

Let $P = x_0x_1 \dots x_k$.
if $x_0x_{k-1} \in E(G)$ **then**
  for $i \in [0, k-2]$ **do**
    if $x_kx_i \in E(G)$ and $x_kx_{i+1} \in E(G)$ **then**
      return $C = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_i, x_k, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{k-1}, x_0)$
if $x_kx_1 \in E(G)$ **then**
  for $i \in [k-1]$ **do**
    if $x_0x_i \in E(G)$ and $x_0x_{i+1} \in E(G)$ **then**
      return $C = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_i, x_0, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_k, x_1)$
return NONE.

5. Conclusion

In this work, we presented an extension of the classical Dirac theorem to the case where $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. We identified the only non-Hamiltonian graph families under this minimum degree condition. Our proof is short, simple, constructive, and self-contained. Then, we provided a polynomial-time algorithm that constructs a Hamiltonian cycle, if exists, of a graph G with $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, or determines that the graph is non-Hamiltonian. The proof we present for the algorithm provides insight into the pattern of vertices on Hamiltonian cycles when $\delta(G) \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. We believe that this insight will be useful in extending the results of this paper to graphs with lower minimum degrees, i.e., in identifying the exceptional non-Hamiltonian graph families when the minimum degree is smaller and constructing the Hamiltonian cycles, if exists. A natural question to ask in this direction is: What are the exceptional non-Hamiltonian graph families when $\delta(G) \leq (n-1)/2$, $\delta(G) \leq \lfloor (n-1)/2 \rfloor$ or $\delta(G) \leq (n-2)/2$? How can we design an algorithm that not only determines whether a Hamiltonian cycle exists in such a case, but also constructs the Hamiltonian cycle whenever it exists. The investigation of these questions is subject of future work.

References

[1] R. M. Karp, Reducibility among Combinatorial Problems, The IBM Research Symposia Series, Springer US, 1972.

[2] G. A. Dirac, Some theorems on abstract graphs, Proc. London Math. Soc. 2 (1952) 69–81.

[3] O. Ore, Note on hamiltonian circuits, Amer. Math. Monthly 65 (1960) 55.

[4] J. A. Bondy, V. Chvátal, A method in graph theory, Discrete Mathematics 15 (1976) 111–135.

[5] J. A. Nash-Williams, On hamiltonian circuits in finite graphs, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 317 (1966) 466–447.

[6] J. A. Nash-Williams, Edge-disjoint Hamiltonian circuits in graphs with vertices of large valency, Academic Press, London, 1971.

[7] M. S. Rahman, M. Kaykobad, On hamiltonian cycles and hamiltonian paths, Inform. Process. Lett. 94 (2005) 37–51.

[8] K. H. M. Mehedy, L., M. Kaykobad, An improved degree based condition for hamiltonian cycles, Inform. Process. Lett. 102 (2007) 108–112.

[9] R. Li, A new sufficient condition for hamiltonicity of graph, Inform. Process. Lett. 98 (2006) 159–161.

[10] L. R. Li, Shengjia, J. Feng, An efficient condition for a graph to be hamiltonian, Discrete Applied Math. 155 (2007) 1842–1845.

[11] H. A. Jung, On maximal circuits in finite graphs, Ann. Discrete Math. 3 (1978) 129–144.

[12] M. A. Bauer, D., E. Schmeichel, A simple proof of a theorem of jung, Discrete Math. 79 (1989/90) 147–152.

[13] H. S. L. Bauer, D., E. Schmeichel, Recognizing tough graphs are NP-hard, Discrete Applied Math. 28 (1990) 191–195.

[14] B. H. J. M. A. Bauer, D., E. Schmeichel, Polynomial algorithms that prove an NP-hard hypothesis implies an NP-hard conclusion, Discrete Applied Math. 120 (2002) 13–23.

[15] R. Häggkvist, On the structure of non-hamiltonian graphs i, Combin. Probab. Comput. 1 (1992) 27–34.

[16] D. B. West, Introduction to Graph Theory, 2nd Edition, Prentice-Hall, 2001.